





and classical lore, is truly wonderful. We cannot here enter into an elaborate discussion of its merits. Suffice it to say, that "Zenaida" should be in the possession of every son and daughter of Kentucky."

A few copies can be had at Keenon & Crutcher's.

19 Japanese ri in length, which is equal to 32 English miles.

37 "An 'improved apparatus,' recently patented, and fully described in the *Mechanic's Magazine*—"for raising and lowering the skirts of ladies' dresses"—is styled by the *Home Journal*—"Ladies' Highdraulics."

The Detroit Free Press of the 13th says:  
Dussan Hoos. - The market is getting more animated. A lot of thirty, at light weight, sold at \$4 25; forty, averaging 21 1/2 lbs., at \$5; sixteen, averaging 22 1/2 lbs., at \$4 60; and twenty, averaging 22 1/2 lbs., at \$4 75.

his place will open on *This Morning*, in the second story of Odd Fellows' Hall. It is to be under his care, and he pressinglly invites *all* to send, free of charge. It is his object to get the school under fair operation—to make it worth, of the city under whose superintendence it is conducted; and to this object his utmost endeavors shall be devoted. All communications and references to be directed to

R. GLISPIE,  
Secretary of the School Trustees.

**Purkins & Monroe,**  
Attorneys and Counselors at Law,  
LEAVENWORTH CITY, K. T.,  
Have associated themselves in the practice of  
the Law in all the Courts of the Territory.  
Office on Main street, over Smoot, Russell & Co.'s  
Bank.

**FASHIONABLE TAILORING,**  
 In Main street, in Mrs. Noel's house, opposite Mr. V. H. Averell's Drug Store. He respectfully requests share of the public patronage, and will warrant all work done to give satisfaction, and his prices as moderate as those of any other Tailor in the city. He has formerly been in business in Versailles, and refers to his customers there.

**JNO. W. VOORHIES.**

\_\_\_\_\_



[From the Louisville Democrat.]

JUDGE MCNE'S DECISION  
IN THE JAILER CASE.Thos. Bateman vs. Judge Garland, & Application  
Same vs. A. Monroe.

These cases were, by consent of parties, heard together. The facts were mainly agreed and are substantially as follows: On the second day of August, an election was held for the offices of County Judge, County Clerk, Sheriff, Coroner, and Jailor of Jefferson county. The former incumbents were all candidates for election, and the Sheriff, County Clerk, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Jailor was defeated, and the defendant, Monroe, elected in his stead. The petitioner, Thos. Bateman, W. K. Thomas, and Richard Phillips, were candidates for the office of Jailor. The poll-books show that Bateman received 5,641 votes; that Thomas received 3,581 votes; and that Phillips received 53 votes. These numbers include the votes cast upon several pages of the poll-books, which pages were not signed by the clerk at the foot thereof, as directed in the Statute. If these pages are excluded from the count, then Bateman received 3,328 votes, and Thomas received 2,245. By the first ballot of computation, Bateman received a majority of sixty-three votes; by the second mode of computation, Thomas received a majority of two votes.

A certificate of election was given to Thomas, but Bateman insists that he received a majority of the votes cast at the election, and was, therefore, duly elected, and is entitled to the office of Jailor of Jefferson county. He insists, first, that the certificate given to Thomas is void, because it was not given by the proper officers. Second, that it was, and still is, the duty of the County Judge, the Sheriff, and Clerk to compare the polls, and give him a certificate of his election. And they having failed to do so in the premises, he has moved for a writ of mandamus, to compel them to discharge that duty.

He also gave notice to Thomas that he would contest the election, and a contesting board was organized as provided by law, composed of A. Monroe, County Judge, C. M. Thurston, County Clerk, and W. Lynn, a justice of the peace. That board decided that he had not given his notice in the time required by the statute, and, therefore, quashed his motion. He insists that his notice was given in due time, and it was, therefore, the duty of said board, and it still is, to hear his motion, and determine upon the facts the rights of the parties. He has therefore moved for the writ of mandamus against them also, to compel them to hear his motion and determine who is entitled to the office of Jailor.

To the first petition the defendant, Thurston, County Clerk, and Megowan, Sheriff, have responded that they were candidates, and were voted for at that election, and thus interested in the fact or issue, to be found or determined, and could not therefore lawfully compare the polls. Besides, Thurston responds, and the fact is conceded, that at the time when the law required that the polls should be compared he was confined to his bed by sickness, and was, therefore, unable to act. The late County Judge responds that he was willing to act, and did so, and the two justices of the peace, Clements and Matlack, until they received to exclude him from the computation of votes, such pages of the poll-books as had not been signed by the clerk. Differing from them on this proposition he retired from the board, and declined further to act. This he did with apparent, and it may be added, with pardonable disgust.

To the second petition the defendants, Monroe, County Judge, Thurston, County Clerk, and Lynn, Justice of the peace, have responded that the notice to contest the election was not given within ten days after the final action of the board of examiners, as required by the statutes, and that, therefore, they had no authority to hear and determine the plaintiff's motion.

Such are the leading facts, and such the objects of these proceedings. It is obvious that the questions arising upon these motions are of the highest interest and importance to the parties and the public. These questions have been argued by the counsel chosen on either side, with great earnestness and signal ability. For this, and other sufficient causes, it has been deemed not inappropriate to present, as briefly as may be, the reasons which have preceded judgments which are about to be rendered.

Upon the first petition, these questions are presented:

1. Has the plaintiff adopted his true and appropriate remedy?

2. Had he, when he filed his petition, a clear legal right to the office into which he desires to be inducted?

3. Was it not the legal duty of the defendants to compare the poll-books, and give their certificate of his election?

If these questions may all be answered in the affirmative, then judgment should be rendered for the plaintiff; if any of them may be answered in the negative, then his motion should be denied, and petition dismissed; and these questions will now be considered, in the order above stated:

1. Has the plaintiff adopted his true and appropriate remedy?

This proceeding is, from its nature, very unusual. The writ of mandamus is not a writ of right; it may be granted only in extraordinary cases, as a general rule, to a party who has otherwise an adequate legal remedy. It is, in the language of Lord Mansfield, a very beneficial writ, and the best method of preserving it, is to be sparing in the use of it. In England, the power of granting it belonged exclusively to the Court of King's Bench, and hence, it has there been beautifully styled one of the "flowers of that Court." This may account for the unusual interest of Lord Mansfield in this writ, and explained the caution with which he is said to have dispensed it. He took especial pains, upon all proper occasions, to state the true grounds upon which it should be granted or refused; and, for this reason, his opinions upon this subject, have been followed wherever the writ has been beneficially used—indeed, it is difficult to find a case, since he left the King's Bench, that has not been based upon the rules laid down by him. One of these rules, and one which has been adopted by our own Appellate Court, and by courts almost universally, is, that the writ should never be granted, except in the absence of other adequate legal remedies, or, in other words, except in the absence of any other remedy for the redress of the wrong. The Court of King's Bench used it only as a supplementary to the defects of other jurisdiction. In this rule is often misunderstood. When it is said that there must be an absence of other legal remedies, Courts must be understood to mean remedies against the defendant. That the prosecutor may have other remedies against other parties connected with the case, is no reason for the withholding the writ. He must have some other adequate, legal remedy against the party sued. It is not, therefore, as contended by the defendants' counsel, a sufficient reason for refusing the writ in this case, that the plaintiff might have contested the election with Mr. Thomas. The real question is, has he any other adequate legal remedy against these defendants? It is his duty to compare the polls as a board, and to give certificates of election; and they have, with our good cause, failed to discharge that duty, which remedy has the plaintiff against them, except that which he has adopted? None has been suggested, and now, in the opinion of the Court, none can be suggested. It follows, therefore, that he has adopted his only, therefore his true and appropriate remedy, if he has such a right as can now be enforced. And this brings us to the second question.

2. Had the plaintiff, when he filed his petition, a clear legal right to the office into which he seeks to be inducted? If he was voted for by a majority of the qualified voters of the county, at a regular election, held according to law, then, under the constitution of the State, he was duly elected; and by virtue of the election was entitled to the office, and therefore to the certificate of election, as the evidence of the right. If he did not receive such a majority, as a matter of course, he had no such right. Now, according to the agreed facts, and indeed, according to the response of Megowan and Thurston, the poll-books, as returned to the clerk's office, show that Bateman received sixty-three votes more than his competitor, Thomas. But a portion of the poll-books was excluded by justices Clements and Mat-

lack, whereby a different result was produced. This was done under the following provision of the statute upon elections:

"Each clerk, in the presence of the judges, shall sign his name at the foot of every page of the poll-books, as the election progresses, so that the same may be thereby identified."

It can scarcely be necessary to say that this provision of the statute is merely directory, and that it would be almost absurd to conclude that a candidate should be deprived of his votes, and of the office to which he might be chosen, simply because the clerk has failed to discharge this duty. It is due to defendants' counsel to say, that in the argument of the various questions presented by these motions they have not claimed that these votes should be excluded. They could not to have been excluded.

But it is said that at some of the voting precincts, the place of voting was changed on the day of election; that some of the judges were not sworn, and that all votes taken at such places, by such judges, should be excluded, and that, by the exclusion of these votes, the result will be so changed as to give Thomas a majority. If this is sufficient for a good cause, the place of voting may be changed on the morning of the election to the most convenient place which can be found by the judges, public proclamation of such change first having been made.

Whether, in this case, the adjournment was to the most convenient place, or whether there existed sufficient cause for the adjournment, is not sufficient for me, I will not stop to inquire. It is sufficient in all such cases, that the election is held at convenient public localities, and it does not appear, by reason of the change, any citizen was deprived of his vote; besides, it is to be presumed that, the officers discharged their duty, and therefore, that, in their judgment, there existed sufficient cause for the adjournment, and that the place selected was the one deemed the most convenient for the people, and that no man has been deprived of his vote by the change, proves that they did not materially err in their conclusions. It would not, therefore, be proper to exclude any poll-book for such reason, nor should any importance be attached to the fact that some one of the judges acted as having been sworn. A construction of the statute which would require the exclusion of poll-books for such reasons, instead of fostering and protecting the right of suffrage, would tend to defeat and practically destroy it. "De minimis non curat lex," is a maxim which applies with equal force to the failure of the clerk to sign their names at the foot of each page of the poll-books, to the failure of one of the judges to be sworn—and to any immaterial irregularity in the adjournment of the board from one place to another. They all stand upon the same ground; in themselves they are too inconsiderable and unimportant to be allowed to defeat great and important rights.

It is, therefore, the opinion of the Court, that Bateman received a majority of the votes cast for the office of Jailor, at last August election, and that a certificate should have been given to him; and if it was the legal duty of the defendants to compare the polls, and give certificates of election, it is impossible to deny, that such judgment should be rendered as would compel them to discharge their duties. This brings us to the third question.

3d. Was it the legal duty of the County Judge, County Clerk, and Sheriff, to compare the poll-books, and give certificates of election?

As this matter is regulated entirely by the statutes, the inquiry can only be answered by reference to the statute itself. It reads as follows:

"The presiding Judge of the County Court, the Clerk thereof, and the Sheriff, or other person acting for him, at an election, shall constitute a board for examining the poll-books of each county, and giving certificates of any election. Any two of them may constitute a board, but if only one is a candidate, he shall have no voice in the decision of his own case. If from any cause, two of the before named persons can not, in whole or in part, act in comparing the polls, their places shall be supplied by the two justices of the peace who may reside nearest the court-house."

It will be recollected that the County Judge, Clerk, and Sheriff, were all candidates for election, and that, therefore, they were all re-elected excepting the County Judge. It is unnecessary to inquire whether other provisions of the statute do not forbid the Sheriff from acting as a member of this, and from discharging every duty pertaining to an election, when he is a candidate. It is certain he can discharge no other duty, and it is, at the least, extremely doubtful whether he could act at all as a member of the examining board. In this should be the case, then, as the Clerk was unable to act on account of sickness, the petition ought to be dismissed. But, as before remarked, this construction of the statute is somewhat doubtful, and it will be assumed, therefore, that the duties and powers of these are the same.

The question now arises out of the fact that there were all candidates. If they had not been, it would undoubtedly have been their duty to convene as a board, and compare the polls, ascertain the correctness of the summing up of the votes, and give triplicate or more certificates of election. Any two of them might have constituted a board. And if only one of them had been a candidate he might, notwithstanding the fact, have acted as a member of the board, but he could have had no voice in the decision of his own case. In part, he could not have acted. Was not this the condition of each one of the defendants? All three of them being candidates, none of them could act, in whole, but all of them were disqualified, in part. Now, what is the state of things? The statute (supra) has provided for just such a contingency. The language is, "If only one is a candidate, he shall have no voice, in whole, or in part, act in comparing the polls, their places shall be supplied by the two justices of the peace who may reside nearest the court-house. Here, not only two or three, but all of them were disqualified, in part, for neither of them could have a voice in the decision of his own case. The plain and obvious meaning of the statute is, that at least two, and a majority of the board should be disqualified, in whole, and they shall not be interested, in whole or in part, and thus be left without impeachment from fraudulent conduct. This is further evident from the fact that, although two are required to withdraw, a third, though interested, may remain in the board, and act in conjunction with the Justices. The statute only requires that at least a majority shall be disqualified, but it does not require that the disqualified could not have acted in their own cases, still they should have acted in the cases of other candidates, and then given way to the two Justices. The statute will not admit of such a construction. But one board is contemplated. This was necessary, in order to have uniformity in the certificates. Whenever two of the members are unable, for any cause, to act, in whole, or in part, their places are to be supplied by two other Justices, in whole, or in part, their membership in the board, and the law plainly requires that a new board shall be formed.

It need scarcely be added, that there was an obvious impropriety in the defendants acting as members of an official board, convened alone to determine facts in which all had an important personal and pecuniary interest.

"None in such case, as *Judex debet esse*," is a maxim which applies here as well as elsewhere. And if the state did not in terms forbid their participation in this matter, it is by no means certain that they might not in this case have answered satisfactorily. "We could not act as judges in our own cases." For, as was said by defendants' counsel, the law never requires of a gentleman that which a gentleman cannot do.

But it is contended that the certificate given by Messrs. Clements and Matlack is void, because they were not the justices who resided nearest the court-house. It is essential although they are the justices of the district in which the court-house is situated, and have their offices within fifty yards of the court-house, yet, by actual measurement, it has been ascertained that one of the justices of the other district resides a few feet nearer the court-house than they do.

Suppose this to be true, and the two justices had no power to act; does it thence follow that it was the duty of these defendants to act? The question is not whether Messrs. Clements and Matlack had authority to act, but whether these defendants are in duty bound to act. It is therefore unnecessary to decide whether, within the

spirit, intent, and real meaning of the statute, they were the two justices who ought to have acted. It is sufficient here that it was the duty of some two justices, either the one or others, and therefore not the duty of the defendants. It follows from what has been said, that the defendants were not competent members of the examining board, and that they cannot be required to give a certificate of election, which would be a legal disqualification from performing, and which the law has devolved on other officers.

The motion against the contesting board presents but two questions, and these will now be briefly considered.

First, Has this Court the power, by writ of mandamus, to compel the contesting board to hear and decide the motion of plaintiff; if it was their duty to have done so?

Second, Was it the duty of the contesting board to hear and decide the motion?

As this question must be answered in the negative, a discussion of the first question is unnecessary. The motion was given in time, the board could not take jurisdiction of the case. If, on the other hand, it was given in time, the law required that they should hear and determine the contest. So that the real question is, did the plaintiff give his notice within the time allowed by the statute? That was the only question decided by the board, and the only one they had power to decide, if their opinion was correct.

The statute requires that the notice shall be given within ten days after the final action of the examining board. It was not given until the eleventh day after such final action, if it day on which the board finished their labors is to be counted. And whatever conflict of opinion may exist in other States as to the propriety of including that day in the computation, there is no room for doubt as to what the law is in Kentucky. The Court of Appeals in the late case of *Smith vs. Chiles*, have decided that in all such cases it must be included. "When the computation is to be made from an act done, the day in which the act was done must be included, because, since there is no fraction of a day, the act relates to the first moment of the day in which it was done." (13th, Ben. Monroe, 461.) And why should it not be so? The final action of the board was on the first of August. The law required that the notice be given on that day, and, therefore, it should be taken into the computation. But it is unnecessary to discuss a point already, and so recently, settled by the Appellate Court. That Court may have decided the question wrongly, but whether they have decided it right or wrong, their decision must remain the law of the State till they shall see proper to overrule it. The contesting board could not disregard the authority of that court. Neither can this Court disregard it. It is the law of the State. Such was the decision of the defendant, therefore they dismissed the plaintiff's motion. Having discharged their duty according to law, it follows that there can be no just cause of complaint against them; and, therefore, the writ of mandamus must again be denied.

The peculiar circumstances which have produced this litigation have not been overlooked, and it is impossible to deny, that such judgment should be rendered as would compel them to discharge their duties. This brings us to the third question.

3d. Was it the legal duty of the County Judge, County Clerk, and Sheriff, to compare the poll-books, and give certificates of election?

As this matter is regulated entirely by the statutes, the inquiry can only be answered by reference to the statute itself. It reads as follows:

"The presiding Judge of the County Court, the Clerk thereof, and the Sheriff, or other person acting for him, at an election, shall constitute a board for examining the poll-books of each county, and giving certificates of any election. Any two of them may constitute a board, but if only one is a candidate, he shall have no voice in the decision of his own case. If from any cause, two of the before named persons can not, in whole or in part, act in comparing the polls, their places shall be supplied by the two justices of the peace who may reside nearest the court-house."

It will be recollected that the County Judge, Clerk, and Sheriff, were all candidates for election, and that, therefore, they were all re-elected excepting the County Judge. It is unnecessary to inquire whether other provisions of the statute do not forbid the Sheriff from acting as a member of this, and from discharging every duty pertaining to an election, when he is a candidate. It is certain he can discharge no other duty, and it is, at the least, extremely doubtful whether he could act at all as a member of the examining board. In this should be the case, then, as the Clerk was unable to act on account of sickness, the petition ought to be dismissed. But, as before remarked, this construction of the statute is somewhat doubtful, and it will be assumed, therefore, that the duties and powers of these are the same.

The question now arises out of the fact that there were all candidates. If they had not been, it would undoubtedly have been their duty to convene as a board, and compare the polls, ascertain the correctness of the summing up of the votes, and give triplicate or more certificates of election. Any two of them might have constituted a board. And if only one of them had been a candidate he might, notwithstanding the fact, have acted as a member of the board, but he could have had no voice in the decision of his own case. In part, he could not have acted. Was not this the condition of each one of the defendants? All three of them being candidates, none of them could act, in whole, but all of them were disqualified, in part. Now, what is the state of things? The statute (supra) has provided for just such a contingency. The language is, "If only one is a candidate, he shall have no voice, in whole, or in part, act in comparing the polls, their places shall be supplied by the two justices of the peace who may reside nearest the court-house. Here, not only two or three, but all of them were disqualified, in part, for neither of them could have a voice in the decision of his own case. The plain and obvious meaning of the statute is, that at least two, and a majority of the board should be disqualified, in whole, and they shall not be interested, in whole or in part, and thus be left without impeachment from fraudulent conduct. This is further evident from the fact that, although two are required to withdraw, a third, though interested, may remain in the board, and act in conjunction with the Justices. The statute only requires that at least a majority shall be disqualified, but it does not require that the disqualified could not have acted in their own cases, still they should have acted in the cases of other candidates, and then given way to the two Justices. The statute will not admit of such a construction. But one board is contemplated. This was necessary, in order to have uniformity in the certificates. Whenever two of the members are unable, for any cause, to act, in whole, or in part, their places are to be supplied by two other Justices, in whole, or in part, their membership in the board, and the law plainly requires that a new board shall be formed.

It need scarcely be added, that there was an obvious impropriety in the defendants acting as members of an official board, convened alone to determine facts in which all had an important personal and pecuniary interest.

"None in such case, as *Judex debet esse*," is a maxim which applies here as well as elsewhere. And if the state did not in terms forbid their participation in this matter, it is by no means certain that they might not in this case have answered satisfactorily. "We could not act as judges in our own cases." For, as was said by defendants' counsel, the law never requires of a gentleman that which a gentleman cannot do.

But it is contended that the certificate given by Messrs. Clements and Matlack is void, because they were not the justices who resided nearest the court-house. It is essential although they are the justices of the district in which the court-house is situated, and have their offices within fifty yards of the court-house, yet, by actual measurement, it has been ascertained that one of the justices of the other district resides a few feet nearer the court-house than they do.

Suppose this to be true, and the two justices had no power to act; does it thence follow that it was the duty of these defendants to act? The question is not whether Messrs. Clements and Matlack had authority to act, but whether these defendants are in duty bound to act. It is therefore unnecessary to decide whether, within the

plaintiff gives notice of appeal.

It is becoming and proper that a day should be set apart, when the people of our State may, with joyous hearts, unite in rendering thanks to God who has showered so many blessings upon our land and protected us as a State and Nation.

While every part of our common country has been greatly blessed, no portion of it has received a larger share of Divine bounty than our beloved Commonwealth. With a fertile soil and a salubrious climate, we have been rarely chastened by pestilence and never by famine; with a government of our own choice, we are secured in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The past year has been crowned with plenty, and the husbandman is rejoicing in the fruits of his fields and the abundance of his store.

For these and all other blessings we are indebted to the goodness and mercy of God, and it is meet that as a people we should bow before His throne with hearts full of thankfulness and gratitude.

Wherefore, I, C. S. MOREHEAD, do hereby set apart and appoint THURSDAY, the 25th day of November, 1858, to be observed as a day of public thanksgiving and prayer, and do hereby recommend and request the people of Kentucky to observe the same as such.

In Testimony Whereof, I have set my hand and caused the seal of the Commonwealth to be affixed this 5th day of November, 1858, and in the 67th year of the Commonwealth.

C. S. MOREHEAD.

By the Governor:  
MASON BROWN, Sec'y of State.

## Later from Europe.

SANCTO HOOK, Nov. 15—2 P. M.—The steamship Vanderbilt, from Southampton on the 14th, by four days later advices from Europe, has passed this point.

The steamer Prince Alb arrived out on the 31st. The Canada reached Liverpool on the 31st.

Spain is preparing to act against Mexico. A new company has been formed for the purpose of laying a submarine cable from G. way to Belle Isle, along the St. Lawrence to Quebec, and thence by land to the Pacific coast. The title of the company is "The British and Canadian Submarine Telegraph Company, and the capital £1,500,000.

Bank of France returns for October show a falling off in specie of £1,170,000, and the returns of the Bank of England show a decrease of £165,000.

The arrival of specie since Saturday had amounted to £245,500.

A new gold field had been discovered in Australia.

There had been a considerable augmentation of the Spanish fleet, and the preparations against Mexico were being carried forward with vigor.

A French vessel from a canon had been seized by the Portuguese at Obo, and taken to Mozambique, but it was subsequently returned to its owners. The latter suffered great loss by the seizure.

The popular feeling at Lisbon was very strong against England and its policy of non-interference in the affairs of Spain and Portugal.

It was rumored that a change was about being made in the Ministry of Prussia.

The Sultan of Turkey had visited the United States frigate Washburn.

Piedmont coincides with France in requesting of the Pope the deliverance of the Jewish child, Mouton, to his parents.

The rebels captured Esplanen, but afterwards retreated.

By the combined movements of the British troops, the rebels were being hemmed in at China ca.

Affairs at Bombay continue quiet.

Several skirmishes had taken place at Oude, in which much gallantry was displayed. They all ended in the total rout and great destruction of the rebels. The rebels in great numbers were retreating.

The steamer Nova Scotia, from Quebec, Sept. 23d, passed Donaghadee on the afternoon of the 31st, and probably arrived in the river Mersey next morning.

The steamship Hudson, of the Bremen line, was burned at Bremerhaven on the night of the 21st inst. She was to have sailed on the following Saturday, and doubtless had a large part of her cargo on board. There was an insurance of £70,000 at Lloyd's on the vessel.

A new submarine cable has been laid between England and Holland.

The Bank of Vienna has resumed specie payments.

A new minister has been appointed in Prussia, Prince Hohenzoller, President General; Bismarck, Minister of War; M. Schlieffen, Foreign Affairs.

The crew of the French brig Anna, which was shipwrecked on the coast of Africa, was rescued by the crew taken on board.

Great excitement existed at Bedford, York shire, in consequence of a wholesale poison in from lozenges, in which arsenic had been mixed by mistake, instead of plaster of paris. Fifteen deaths had already occurred, and sixty or seventy persons were seriously ill.

A letter from St. Petersburg says the Russian Government will let Kessler, the Chinese minister, about the 14th of August, for Peking.

They were received on the 14th, by the Chinese officers with carriages, who conferred them to Gen. where they were received by Mongolian officers, who proceeded with them.

There was great activity in the Spanish naval arsenal, in consequence of preparations for the Mexican expedition, the naval force being augmented considerably by new vessels.

The new English ocean telegraph company is to connect Galway with Quebec, with the English possessions on the Pacific. The wire is to be a total of 18,000 miles from one end to the other.

Sir L. Bulwer, British Minister to Persia, was arrested at Pera on the 21st of October, and taken to the police station, in consequence of a collision while riding in the street, between his attendant groom, and some of the Sultan's suite.

AUSTRIA.—Several Prussian, and other German papers had been confiscated at Vienna, the police.

Madame Pfeiffer, the celebrated traveler, is dead.

INDIA.—Telegraph advices state that the rebels attacked an English station, September 30th, and subsequently evacuated it, and retreated towards Fuzgaur, which latter place they attacked and captured October 2d. They were afterwards driven from this point by a detachment. A column of British troops is now sent to the scene of the rebellion to suppress the rebellion.

Lord Clyde is en route for Lucknow.

Australian advices are to September 15th. Two ships left Sydney for England with 138,000 ounces of gold.

Very rich gold fields have been discovered to the north of Sydney.

The New South Wales Assembly had granted £20,000 for the purchase of ten gunboats for the mail service via Panama. Trade is dull.

[Correspondence of the Evening News.]

From the Frontiers.

WESTPORT, Nov. 7, 1858.

The Santa Fe mail arrived yesterday, bringing dates to the 15th of October. The news is very important. The most exciting intelligence is contained in a letter dated the 22d of September, eight miles west of the San Francisco mountains. The emigrant company, by the principal persons of whom the latter is signed, had arrived in safety at the crossing of the Rio Colorado, near the Mohave villages. Shortly afterwards they were attacked by three hundred Mohave Indians, who most of the white men were engaged in, and the fighting raged for an hour, and in the end their stock was a bloody field.

In this engagement the emigrants lost three men, two women, and four children killed, with sixteen wounded. The Indians took all the stock, except 19 head of cattle and 11 horses. The emigrants then retreated on the return route in the night, taking with them but two wagons wherein to haul a small supply of provisions and bedding for the women and children—the whole party at the date of the letter consisting of 133 men, 33 women, old and young, and 47 children from the two week back up.

Soon after the retreat, starvation already staring the company in the face, they fortunately met another emigrant party, who generously shared their provisions and comforts. This party, out of 500 head of stock, had but 145 left, and they were in a most miserable condition.

The gold fever is still "king" along the border, and numbers will leave homes and business in the spring to go in search of the glittering metal. The news from the gold regions is mostly favorable, but occasionally such a letter as the following throws a wet blanket on the fevered party. This letter was received last night by Bernard & Co., from a gentleman of respectability and education.

Dear Sir, I arrived here in 27 days from Westport. I found all right. The Indians are all peaceable. The gold fever is not so high here as in Westport. The 70 or 80 men that were in the neighborhood of Pike's Peak have all left—some for Santa Fe, some for the States, and some for Arkansas—starving and afloat. The most gold that was found by any one man was seven dollars.

Other accounts of the same date are of a different tenor, and gentlemen who have been at Pike's Peak and suspected the company are preparing to go out again. I shall give you all the intelligence I receive, whether favorable or unfavorable. The people want the truth.

MAN KILLED IN CASEY COUNTY.—We learn that on Thursday last, in Casey county, a man named Wm. Earles was killed by another named Chas. Elder. The two had had a quarrel. Elder rode away from Earles, telling him he wanted no further quarrel or words. Earles dismounted from his horse, as the latter shot him, so that he died immediately.—*Lou. Dem.*, 11th.

## Called Meeting of the Kentucky River Navigation Company.

In compliance with an act of the last General Assembly, entitled "An act to incorporate the Kentucky River Navigation Company," approved February 17th, 1856, a meeting of the company was held in said act is hereby called to meet at the court-house in Lexington on Wednesday, the 24th inst., for the purpose of "fixing the times and places for opening books for the subscription of stock," and the transaction of other business. All persons interested in the affairs of the company of the Kentucky River and its tributaries, from Frankfort to the "Forks," by the building of additional locks and dams, are hereby invited to attend said meeting. A full and general attendance is solicited.

Wm. O. Butler, A. A. Curtis, E. F. Nutall, Hiram McGuire, Sidney Rowlett, John Chambers, Samuel Steele, G. W. Salter, T. W. Mendenhall, C. C. Caldwell, Tucker Woodson, W. T. Moberly, James B. Clay, Matthews Skelton, Theo. Kohlhaas.

Chairmen of the committees of their respective counties.

IT is papers friendly to the movement will please notice.

TEN RUNAWAY NEGROES CAPTURED.—A day or two ago one or two parties called at the office of the U. S. Marshal, in order to obtain information concerning the negro slaves that had run away from Mason county, Ky., a few nights previous, and were nowhere to be found. It was supposed they had come here, and were concealed in this vicinity; but while plans were formed for recovering the fugitives, intelligence was received of their capture at a point near here.

It appears that a free negro woman, residing in this State, on the Ohio river, near or opposite Mayville, had made an arrangement with the slaves to leave their master; had, indeed, influenced their minds with a desire for freedom, and taught them the best means of escape. They were to come, at a certain hour of the night, to a certain point on the river, where the woman's husband was to be in waiting with a skiff, and bring them safely to this side; the woman herself crossing over the first bar person laid to the enterprise.

The boat and the man were there, but the negroes missed the locality, getting about a mile below the point, and not knowing what to do in this perplexed emergency. While they were in this perplexed condition, a party of Kentuckians who were on their trail suddenly came upon them, took them all captives, and carried them back to their masters. The Kentuckians afterward arrested the free negroes, and lodged her in jail, where, it is supposed, she will be sent to the Penitentiary for life. Her husband made good his escape.

The slaves had concealed themselves, according to instructions, for nearly two days after their flight, in which they would have been perfectly successful but for their topographical blunder, by which their masters saved \$2,000 or \$3,000.

Cin. Enquirer.

THE CROWDS COMING.—The N. O. Bulletin of Wednesday says: The crowds that have so long been drunken up—and our spelling—have at length broken loose, and they are now coming down on us in true avalanche fashion. The cold weather, which though usually and elsewhere



